



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

AMERICAN ORIENTAL SOCIETY.

Proceedings at Boston and Cambridge, May 20th and 21st, 1863.

THE Society came together for its Annual Meeting on Wednesday, May 20th, 1863, at 10 o'clock A. M., at the room of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, in the Athenæum building, Boston.

Prof. Beck of Cambridge, one of the Vice-Presidents, took the chair and called the Society to order, adverting, as he did so, to the disappointment of the hopes which had been entertained at the last meeting, in Princeton, that the Society would this time enjoy the presence of its President, Dr. Robinson, and to the painful loss which it had sustained, in common with the whole learned world, by his recent decease.

After the reading of the minutes of the previous meeting by the Recording Secretary, reports from the retiring officers were called for and submitted.

The Treasurer presented his accounts, which, after due examination by an auditing committee, were accepted. His general statement of the transactions of the year was as follows:

RECEIPTS.

Balance on hand, May 21st, 1862,	-	-	-	-	-	\$565.95
Member's fees: ann. assessments for 1863-64,	-	-	-	\$45.00		
do. do. for previous years,	-	-	195.00	240.00		
Interest accumulated on deposits in Savings Bank,	-	-	-	73.46		
Sale of Journal,	-	-	-	124.17		
Total receipts of the year,	-	-	-	-	\$437.63	\$1003.58

EXPENDITURES.

Printing of Journal, Vol. VII (balance),	-	-	-	-	-	\$509.26
Expenses of Library and Correspondence,	-	-	-	-	-	35.39
Total expenditures of the year,	-	-	-	-	-	\$544.65
Balance on hand, May 20th, 1863,	-	-	-	-	-	458.93
						\$1003.58

The Treasurer called attention to the considerable diminution of the balance on hand during the past year. This was due in part to the remission by the Society of the assessment for the year 1862-63, and would have been much greater, had there not been unusually large receipts from other sources. He stated that rather more than \$200 was still due the Treasury from members, for assessments of 1861-62 and previous years, not yet paid in. He recommended the authorizing of a special effort to collect these outstanding dues, during the present

interval in the levying of the regular assessments. It was accordingly, upon motion, voted by the Society, that the Treasurer be authorized and instructed to send out bills again to all members in arrears, pressing upon them the desirableness of a settlement, without farther delay, of all accounts past due.

The Librarian read the list of donors to the Library and Cabinet during the year,* and briefly described those of the donations which seemed to call for special notice. But forty-seven titles of printed books, and one of manuscripts, had been added to the catalogue since May last, the most valuable and important accessions having been continuations of series already commenced. The gift of highest value had been one made to the Cabinet by Rev. William Clark, now of West Brattleboro, Vermont, being a collection of eighty-four coins, gold, silver, and copper, of Greek, Roman, Byzantine, and Oriental mintage, many of them of great antiquity and beauty, or of interest from other qualities.

The Committee of Publication reported that the printing of the new Number of the Journal had not yet been begun, but would soon be taken up. The Number would be filled chiefly with contributions from members at home, which had in part been presented at the preceding meeting, and in part would be brought forward at this meeting.†

The Directors announced to the Society that they had adopted for the meeting the order proposed by the Committee of Arrangements, which was as follows: to devote the session of Wednesday forenoon entirely to the transaction of business and other matters proper to be brought forward at the Annual Meeting; to assemble again at 4 o'clock, p. m., at the residence of Dr. Peabody, in Cambridge, for the reception of communications; to adjourn in the evening in season to accept an invitation kindly extended by Dr. Beck to the members of the Society and their ladies, to be present at a social gathering at his house; and to come together for a continuation of the literary session, in Boston, at 9 o'clock on Thursday morning. Farther, that they had re-appointed the Committee of Publication of the preceding year. That they had designated New Haven as the place of the next Semi-annual Meeting, to be held on Wednesday, October 14th, 1863, and had named Profs. Salisbury, Hadley, and Whitney as a Committee of Arrangements for it.

The Directors also presented the names of persons whom they nominated for election to membership in the Society, and the Society thereupon proceeded by ballot to accept and ratify the nominations. As Corresponding Members, were thus elected

Bhau Dâji, Esq., of Bombay.

Babu Râjendraâlâ Mitra, of Calcutta.

* The donations received prior to the meeting of October, 1862, are acknowledged in the last Part of the Seventh Volume of the Society's Journal.

† Prof. Whitney, on Biot and Weber's views respecting the relation of the Chinese and Hindu Asterisms, with an addition, upon Müller's recently published opinions upon the same subject; Rev. L. Stilson, on the Kemi Language; J. P. Brown, Esq., a translation of part of a Sûfi treatise on the *Tesavuf*, or Spiritual Life of the Sûfis; Prof. Hadley, on the aspirate mutes of the primitive Indo-European language; Prof. Salisbury, on the tenets of the Arabs, before and since the rise of Islam, respecting predestination and moral responsibility.

The Corresponding Secretary laid before the meeting the correspondence of the past six months, and read such parts of it as were of a character to interest the members present.

The annual reports being now disposed of, Prof. Salisbury rose to direct the attention of the Society anew to the loss it had recently sustained, in the death of its President, Dr. Robinson, and to suggest a formal tribute of respect to his memory. He spoke as follows:

This seems to be the proper time for us to pause, to notice and record the great bereavement which this Society has experienced, since we last met, in the decease of its honored President. There is always a sense of loss, independently of all endearing attachments, or habits of reliance, when one whom we have long been accustomed to count among the living is at length numbered with the departed. But, not to speak here of the rupturing of tender ties of affection, when the person withdrawn from the scenes of earth is one whose character, intellectual abilities, and attainments have attracted the notice, and won the respect, of his countrymen; and especially, if he has been looked up to as the representative of any higher department of labor for the public good; and yet more, if his name has reflected honor upon his country in foreign lands, where older civilization should give a more just appreciation of all that tends to advance the race in knowledge and virtue—I say that, under such circumstances, the void which common human sensibility always suffers by the death of any one whom we have known, is more deeply and widely felt. Such is the case in respect to our late President. This Society is fortunate in having been presided over, during the whole period of its existence, by two men of such eminence, in scholarly qualities and acquisitions, as well as in their appreciation and advocacy of the cause it represents, as Dr. Pickering and Dr. Robinson. To the enthusiasm of our first President in behalf of all learning we owe it, indeed, in great measure, that this Society exists: and our obligations to the second are not inferior, for the support which his well-earned fame as a scholar has been constantly giving to us. Dr. Robinson was not a man of the ardent temperament which all admired in his predecessor in that chair: his calling was not to draw around him new votaries of science, by the contagion of sympathy with a passionate devotion to it; but rather to shine, with a steady, sure light, upon the path of those whom he found already seeking after knowledge. Deliberate in forming his opinions, he was always to be relied upon for whatever conclusions he arrived at, as certain to have arguments in their favor which could not easily be gainsaid. His mind was formed for research, and for building up a solid structure of ascertained truth, stone by stone; but not for flights of imagination. He was also a fair-minded man, ready to recognize, and desirous to possess himself of, all the discoveries of others. No American scholar, perhaps, has come nearer than he, as regards method and scope, in his department, to the high German ideal of a “*Gelehrter*.” As a Hebrew linguist, he was unsurpassed by any of his countrymen, not to say that he led them all; and it may be confidently affirmed that no one, either in this country or in Europe, within the same period, has equalled Dr. Robinson in his contributions to the branch of learning which especially occupied the later years of his life—that of biblical geography. Having twice visited Palestine, after years of preparation, he was able to seize upon and fix many identifications of localities, for the first time, by which he did much to reduce to actual shape our ordinarily too visionary conceptions of the sites of Jewish and early Christian history. His authority in this field of research, as is well known, is classic wherever any value is attached to such knowledge. With all his attainments and widely spread reputation, he was modest, and at the farthest remove from obtrusiveness—yet he preserved a due self-respect. He was a Christian scholar—and as such, I am sure, did not fail to own devoutly that, in the pursuit of learning, as well as in all other walks of life, the Christian spirit of docility is ever to be sought for and cherished; and that, while one must diligently use all merely human appliances for the acquisition of knowledge, there is also a light from above to be obtained by childlike communion with the Father of our spirits.

I am conscious that I do but indicate in the faintest manner the claims of the late President of this Society to our respect and grateful recollection; but this

humble tribute to the memory of our lamented associate is all that my leaden speech allows me to offer. My purpose, however, was not so much to attempt to be the spokesman of the Society, on this occasion, as to move that a committee be appointed, by the Chair, to prepare some suitable resolutions in memory of Dr. Robinson, in the hope that the motion will call forth worthier expressions of our sentiments.

The motion was seconded by Prof. Barrows, of Andover, who offered a brief sketch of the life and labors of Dr. Robinson, and an estimate of his character as a scholar and a teacher:

Sir:—The remarks which have just been made touch a chord that must vibrate long and mournfully in the heart of every American scholar. In consideration of the fact that Dr. Robinson's first work which gained him reputation as a scholar was done in Andover, and also that for many years my department of study has been the same as that which he prosecuted with such illustrious success, it may not be inappropriate that I should, on this occasion, refer briefly to his life, character, and literary labors.

A native of Southington, Connecticut, where he was born on the 10th day of April, 1794, and graduated in 1816 at Hamilton College, he first came to Andover in 1821, to superintend the printing of an edition of the first six books of the Iliad, which he had prepared with notes for the press. He was already a widower, having lost in 1819 his first wife, a daughter of the Rev. S. Kirkland, missionary to the Oneida Indians. In Andover, his acquaintance with Prof. Stuart naturally introduced him to the field of biblical study, and it was during his first residence there, extending from 1821 to 1826, that the fruit of his labors in that department began to appear. Besides holding, for a part of this period, the office of assistant instructor in the department of Sacred Literature, he and Prof. Stuart published conjointly, in 1825, a translation of Winer's Grammar of the New Testament. In the same year he published also a translation of Wahl's *Clavis Philologica Novi Testamenti*—which was his first effort in the line of New Testament lexicography. In 1826 he went to Europe, where he spent four years in study and travel. Here he married, for his second wife, the gifted daughter of Prof. Jacob, of Halle, well known to the literary world under the name of *Talvi*. Returning to Andover, he received in 1830 the appointment of Professor Extraordinary of Sacred Literature, which he held till 1833, when he resigned the office and removed to Boston, residing there till 1837. During the whole term of his second residence in Andover and his subsequent residence in Boston, his labors in the field of biblical literature were abundant. In 1831, the Biblical Repository was established by him in Andover. In this periodical the cause of biblical learning made a sudden and great advance. There had never been in America a theological quarterly of so high a character, at least so far as the department of Sacred Literature was concerned. The volumes of this work which he edited, from 1831 to 1834, are exceedingly valuable, and are to the present day in special demand. In 1832 appeared his revised edition of Calmet's Dictionary of the Bible. This, in its day, was a valuable work; although, as the Professor himself remarks in the preface, it contained very many things which he would never have inserted, but which, being once there, he did not feel himself at liberty to reject. Whoever had occasion to consult it soon learned that the cream of the whole volume was contained in the brief notes that bore the signature "R." That even his own additions to Calmet ceased during his lifetime to be of authority was not his fault, but preëminently his merit. His researches in the field of biblical learning revealed to him many errors into which he had fallen, and he wished it to be understood that neither this work, nor his Bible Dictionary for the young, which appeared in 1833, was any longer worthy of circulation.

In 1832 appeared the first edition of Dr. Robinson's translation of Buttmann's Greek Grammar; in 1839, a second edition of the same; and in 1851, a new translation from the 18th German edition. A Harmony of the Gospels in Greek, in the general order of Le Clerc and Newcome, with Newcome's notes, the whole revised and the Greek text newly arranged, was published under his supervision in Andover in 1834. The Harmony of the Four Gospels, published in Boston in Greek in 1845, and in English in 1846, is a revised form of this. In 1836 appeared Dr. Robinson's own Greek and English Lexicon of the New Testament, and in 1850 a

new edition, mainly re-written. In the same year he issued his translation of Gesenius's Hebrew Lexicon, which has subsequently gone through several editions. To speak of the merits of these lexicons would be a superfluous work. Their widely extended circulation in this country and in Europe, and the persistent use made of them year after year, bear witness to the fact that they meet in a satisfactory way a most important want of biblical scholars. In truth, these lexicons—with their precursors, Robinson's translation of Wahl's *Clavis*, already noticed, and Prof. Gibbs's excellent *Manual Hebrew Lexicon*, abridged from Gesenius—inaugurated for American and English scholars a new and brighter era in the department of biblical lexicography. It is not possible that biblical scholars of the present day should comprehend the difficulties under which those of us labored who began our study of the Holy Scriptures in the original tongues some forty years ago. Were the works just spoken of to be now annihilated, the biblical scholar could find other efficient helps; but it was not so when Prof. Robinson commenced his labors. Then a darkness that was painfully felt rested on the field of biblical lexicography. It is true that his labors here were not isolated and independent. He had many noble coadjutors, in both special and general lexicography, particularly the eminent lexicographers of Germany. Without their aid he could not have accomplished his great and good work in this department. To him God granted the privilege of turning a branch of the mighty stream of philological investigation that had newly burst forth with such freshness and fullness, into the city of our God, that it might thereby be watered and refreshed. In this respect his services are invaluable.

In 1837 he was elected to the professorship of Biblical Literature in the Union Theological Seminary of New York City. But before entering upon its duties, he carried into execution his long-cherished plan of exploring Palestine and the adjacent regions in the interest of biblical learning. His explorations were made in 1838, in company with the Rev. Eli Smith, a veteran missionary of the American Board. The results were afterwards embodied in his *Biblical Researches*, prepared in Berlin, and published simultaneously in the year 1841 in Halle, Boston, and London. In 1852, he made a second visit to Palestine, with special reference to the topography of Jerusalem and the geography of the northern part of Palestine. During the more important part of this second journey, his companion in travel was, as before, the Rev. Eli Smith. From Hasbeiya to Bānias and back, and then on the way to Damascus, until within a day's journey of that city, he was accompanied by the Rev. W. M. Thomson. Afterwards, from Damascus to Ba'albek, and around the northern end of Lebanon to Beirūt, the Rev. S. Robson became his companion. The results of these new investigations are given in the third volume of his second edition of the *Biblical Researches*, published in Boston in 1856, the two previous volumes being a revision of the matter contained in the first edition. It was a great favor, as well to Dr. Robinson as to the Christian church at large, that in these two journeys he was permitted to enjoy the invaluable assistance of such a man as Dr. Eli Smith, a keen observer, thoroughly acquainted as well with the geography of the region as with the language and character of the Arabs. How much the *Biblical Researches* are indebted to him for their present completeness, will perhaps never be known. It is sufficient to say that without his constant aid Dr. Robinson could never have accomplished such a thorough work of exploration as that of which we have the record in these volumes. Equally fortunate was Dr. Robinson in obtaining, for the construction of his maps, the services of a geographer like Kiepert. Whoever reads Kiepert's memoir on the maps accompanying the *Researches*, occupying twenty-seven pages of the third volume of the first edition, will see how much these volumes are indebted to his genius for the accurate maps which add so much to their value.

The *Biblical Researches* are the great work of Dr. Robinson's life, that work which has given him a world-wide celebrity, and helped, more than any other, to change the whole face of biblical geography. Any eulogy which I could bestow upon it would be superfluous. One fact alone is sufficient to attest the estimate put upon it by learned men. Whenever we take up a recent standard work that covers the field of these investigations, whether it be a lexicon, a commentary, a cyclopædia, a biblical dictionary, or a book of travel; whether written in Germany, France, England, or America; we find references to these *Biblical Researches*. They are quoted, not indeed as infallible, but as authority of the highest rank.

It is worth our while to consider for a moment what were the prominent traits of Dr. Robinson's mind, which gave to the results of his researches such a high value. Foremost among these were his indomitable perseverance, and what may be called his severity of investigation. It was not his habit to make up his judgment on a matter till he had learned all about it that was under present circumstances accessible. He did not take alleged facts upon trust, but sifted them thoroughly for himself. His investigations were comprehensive also. They covered the two fields of personal observation and learned research. Some writers on biblical geography do all in the study. Their authority cannot of course rise above its sources; and for want of personal observation they are often betrayed into wrong combinations of facts and wrong judgments. There are others who may be trusted to narrate what they have themselves seen, but whose opinions on questions involving historic research are of no value. But Dr. Robinson was both the careful observer and the learned investigator. Think of him and his companion riding through the desert of Arabia Petraea day after day, with compass before them and watch in hand, carefully noting at every turn of the road the time and change of direction. Think of the same two men crawling through the subterranean passage, 1750 feet in length, that connects the fountain of Siloam with that of the Virgin, that they might verify the fact of their connection. For examples of his thorough research in the line of history, one has only to read what he says of such places as Jerusalem, Hebron, and Tyre. He was not simply a scholar, nor simply an observer. He was a learned observer.

Another equally prominent trait in Dr. Robinson's character was a clear and comprehensive judgment. Not only was he indefatigable and severely accurate in the collection of facts from both history and observation, but he knew how to make use of them in the formation of opinions. There are books which may be fitly characterized as vast storehouses of facts, which, nevertheless, their authors were unable to turn to any good account. We value them for the data which they furnish, rather than for any opinions which they express based upon these data. But Dr. Robinson had a remarkably clear and penetrating apprehension of the bearing of the facts which he had collected upon the questions which he was investigating. Hence the verdict of the learned world, that his judgments, though they may be in particular cases erroneous, are in the main remarkably distinguished for solidity and correctness, and that in all cases they are worthy of the highest consideration.

The failings of Dr. Robinson were in the line of his excellencies. He was both cautious and confident in his judgments. His opinions were the result of mature investigation; he had learned from experience to rely upon them as correct, and it is not wonderful that he was sometimes uncomfortably tenacious of them. In controversy he did not always appreciate the arguments of his opponents, or treat them with the consideration which they deserved.

His character as an instructor grew immediately out of his character as a man and a scholar. Severely accurate and indomitably persevering in his own investigations, he could not tolerate looseness nor indolence in his pupils. Perhaps he did not always make due allowance for minds originally cast in a different mould from his own. With him the object of pursuit was truth naked and unadorned. For digressions and side questions he had no taste. In this respect he differed widely from Prof. Stuart. Some of the happiest efforts of that remarkable man in the lecture-room were, as is well known, what might be termed *excursus*, in the literal sense of the word. But Dr. Robinson adhered rigidly to the subject before him. The student who attempted an *excursus* with him was in danger of being stopped in a way that he would always remember. Perhaps he would bring the text-book up to his eyes, remarking in a dry tone, "I find nothing of that here." All whose object was simply the investigation of truth found in his lecture-room abundant satisfaction. But if any came with the expectation of being entertained by brilliant flights of fancy, they were sure to be disappointed. Had he united with his remarkable fullness and accuracy as a teacher somewhat more of the genial element, and introduced into his writings a little more of the imaginative, then in him would have been realized the words of the poet:

Omne tulit punctum, qui miscuit utile dulci.

During the last years of his life, Dr. Robinson had on hand a Geography of the Holy Land. To all biblical scholars it must be a source of deep regret that he has

left this unfinished. In a letter to me, dated January 28th, 1859, he spoke in a desponding way of his inability to work, arising from the state of his health, which had been broken by two fevers in two successive years; adding that, if called upon to labor or write for even an hour, he was wholly exhausted; that he had no desire, no heart for work; and whether the power would ever return was known only to God. That winter and the preceding he had escaped the fever, and his health gradually improved, so that afterwards he was again able to perform some labor, and his friends cherished the hope that he would yet complete his last undertaking in behalf of sacred literature. But such was not the will of God. He has gone, but his works remain an invaluable treasure to Christendom. Others may hereafter go beyond him, but it will be by availing themselves of the precious results of his unwearied toil in the department of biblical learning.

Dr. Pickering, of Boston, referred to the evidence which had come under his notice, in far distant countries, of the value put upon Dr. Robinson's works in aid of Biblical interpretation.

Dr. Beck, of Cambridge, gave an account of his early acquaintance with Dr. Robinson, commencing with the latter's application for information respecting the means of study in Germany, in anticipation of his first visit to that country. He farther spoke of his eminent qualities as a scholar, especially of his exceeding thoroughness, and complete mastery of everything he undertook.

Prof. Salisbury's proposal of a Committee to prepare resolutions having been accepted by the Society, the presiding officer designated Prof. Salisbury, Prof. Barrows, and Prof. Proudfit of New Brunswick as members of that Committee. They reported the following resolutions, which were unanimously adopted:

Resolved, That the American Oriental Society has been bereaved, by the death of Dr. Edward Robinson, its late President, of an associate and officer on whom it greatly depended for support and direction, and whose distinguished abilities and fame have contributed to gain for Oriental studies the favorable regard of men of culture in this country, and added much to the good name of the Society abroad.

Resolved, That the Corresponding Secretary be requested to communicate the sentiments of the Society, as above expressed, to the family of our late President, and to publish them in our Journal.

The Corresponding Secretary called attention to the recent death of another member, Dr. Convers Francis, of the Harvard Theological Seminary, Cambridge, who had for some years been a never-failing attendant at our annual meetings, and by his presence, his communications, and the part he took in our discussions, had added greatly to the pleasure and profit we had derived from them. He hoped that some of those that knew him best would not let the occasion pass without paying the merited tribute to his worth.

Prof. Peabody, of Cambridge, then rose and gave an account of the life and services of Dr. Francis, his acquirements as a scholar, his merits as a teacher, and the leading features of his intellectual and moral character:

Rev. Dr. Francis was graduated at Harvard College in 1814. His professional life was almost equally divided between a pastorate at Watertown and the Chair of Pulpit Eloquence and the Pastoral Care at Cambridge. As a parish minister, he enjoyed, to a degree seldom exceeded, the respect and affection of his flock, and the distinguishing regard of the surrounding community. Assiduous and affectionate in the private duties of his charge, grave, wise, serious, and earnest as a preacher, and endowed with rare versatility and affluence in the colloquial discussion of weighty themes, he was not only chosen by the electing board of the University,

but designated by the favoring suffrages of a large portion of his clerical brethren, as the successor of the late Henry Ware, Jr., who had been constrained by the failure of health to resign his professorship.

In his new office he was distinguished by conscientious diligence, uniform amenity of intercourse with his pupils, and the constant endeavor to elevate the prevailing standard of theological and general scholarship among the clergy under his influence. In his wider social relations he had many strong friends, and no enemies. Warm in sympathies, broad and comprehensive in charity, zealously interested in all worthy philanthropic enterprizes, he embraced every mode of usefulness in which he could serve the community as the Christian citizen. For many months before his death, his countenance gave too certain presage of fixed disease and rapid decline; but he hardly remitted his full measure of active duty while consciousness lasted. He met his classes at his own house till within a week of his death. At the close of the first day on which he had been willing to deem himself too ill to work, he sank into a comatose state, and thence, four days later, into painless dissolution.

Dr. Francis was preëminently a student, and that for his entire life. Close as was his fidelity as a pastor, he found time for extensive and varied acquisitions, and he then commenced the collection of his large and curious library, which contains, it is believed, a greater diversity of rare books, in proportion to its size, than any other library in New England, and which bears in almost every volume traces of its owner's mastery of its contents. He was among the earliest of our divines to become conversant with the German language, literature, and theology. He had an ever-hospitable mind, held his opinions always subject to revision, his views open to new light. Hence, with firm and operative faith in great principles and fundamental truths, there was an aspect of indecision and vacillation with reference to many of the important subjects of controversy in philosophy and theology. He had, morally, the utmost firmness and tenacity in maintaining the ground once deliberately taken, and was always ready to make personal sacrifice for the right and the true; but on a subject on which it was possible for him to read and study more he seemed unwilling to let his mind seek even a temporary repose. He felt that it was treason to the truth to utter even a provisional verdict in an issue in which there were new advocates on either side who claimed a hearing.

As a teacher, his affluent learning enabled him to direct the researches of his pupils with precision and skill, and no man was ever more generous than he in imparting all that was in his own mind, while his library, with his own careful references, was always freely open to the student. If there was any fault in his instructions, it was the excess of wealth. He poured out more materials for thought than either he or his pupils could arrange into system—pearls unstrung, and more than they had time to string. But as a helper to the zealous and faithful student, as an example of unwearying intellectual toil, and of candor and impartiality in judgment, and as a genial inspirer of devout feeling and high Christian purpose, he has left a precious memory in many hearts, and still lives, we trust, in many lives that have been made worthier and more useful by his influence.

Rev. Mr. Brigham of Taunton, and Rev. Mr. Clarke of Jamaica Plain, former pupils of Dr. Francis, followed with remarks in the same strain, and with anecdotes illustrative of his character.

The deaths, which occurred or were first heard of during the past year, of Prof. R. Elton, Dr. E. McGowan, Rev. D. C. Scudder, and Prof. G. W. Freytag, Corresponding or Honorary Members of the Society, were also announced. Rev. Mr. Hale and Mr. Stoddard of Boston, and Dr. Taylor of Andover, spoke of the loss which both the missionary work and science had sustained in the untimely decease of Mr. Scudder, so soon after his entrance upon his labors in Southern India, referring with admiration to the unusual zeal and thoroughness with which he had taken up the study of India in preparation for his profession, as witnessed by several truly profound and valuable essays which he had published on Indian ethnology and philosophy before leaving this country.

The election of officers for the ensuing year being next in order, the following board, nominated by a Committee appointed by the presiding officer, was balloted for, and elected without dissent:

<i>President</i> —Prof. EDWARD E. SALISBURY,	of New Haven.
<i>Vice-Presidents</i> { Prof. CHARLES BECK, Ph. D.,	“ Cambridge.
Rev. WILLIAM JENKS, D. D.,	“ Boston.
Pres. T. D. WOOLSEY, D.D., LL.D.,	“ New Haven.
<i>Corresponding Secretary</i> —Prof. W. D. WHITNEY,	“ New Haven.
<i>Secr. of Classical Section</i> —Prof. JAMES HADLEY,	“ New Haven.
<i>Recording Secretary</i> —Mr. EZRA ABBOT,	“ Cambridge.
<i>Treasurer</i> —Mr. D. C. GILMAN,	“ New Haven.
<i>Librarian</i> —Prof. W. D. WHITNEY,	“ New Haven.
Rev. RUFUS ANDERSON, D. D.,	“ Boston.
Mr. J. G. COGSWELL, LL. D.,	“ New York.
Prof. W. H. GREEN, D. D.,	“ Princeton.
<i>Directors</i> { Prof. J. J. OWEN, D. D.,	“ New York.
Prof. A. P. PEABODY, D. D.,	“ Cambridge.
Dr. CHARLES PICKERING,	“ Boston.
Prof. JOHN PROUDFIT, D. D.,	“ New Brunswick.

Prof. Salisbury expressed his great unwillingness to assume the place to which the Society had thus designated him, and asked for time for consideration, before he should accept or decline it. The following morning he communicated his acceptance of the office, “yielding up to the judgment of others his own convictions of what would be for the interest of the Society, with a sincere desire to render it such service as he might be able.”

The following communications were presented, the first three at the afternoon and evening meeting in Cambridge, the others Thursday forenoon, in Boston.

1. On the Karaites, by Rev. Charles H. Brigham, of Taunton, Mass.

This paper gave a general view of the sources, the development, the leading teachers, and the influence of the sect of the Karaites.

The name of the Karaites is derived from the Hebrew *kará*, to read or recite, and expresses their character as adherents of the *text* of Scripture. The flourishing period of the sect was from 750 A.D. to 900 A.D., after which, chiefly through the strong opposition of the great Rabbin, Saadia ben Joseph, they rapidly declined, and have never since regained the position even of a formidable heresy. In its leading tenets and its characteristic ideas, Karaism was a revival of Sadducism, differing from Sadducism chiefly in holding to the doctrine of a future life. The way of it was prepared: 1st, by the sect of the Sadducees, the close opponents of all Pharisaic traditions and glosses; 2d, by the Masorite speculations of the 6th century; 3d, by the Jewish physicians, who made the sacred text the basis of their inquiries; 4th, by the false prophets and Messiahs, who appeared in the first half of the 8th century; 5th, by the isolated tribe of the Banu Musa, by some supposed to be the descendants of the captives of the kingdom of Israel.

The immediate founder of the Karaite sect was Anan ben David, the grandson of the Exilarch Chasdai, who lived from 700 to 765, at Basra, Bagdad, and Jerusalem. He was a Rabbin of great learning, and a ruler of extraordinary skill and persuasive power. His principal successors were Malich ben Harmala, Benjamin Nahawendi, Daniel el Kumasi, Bochtan, Judghan, Meswi and Ismael of Ochar, and Meswi of Baalbec. Eldad ha Dani the traveller, and Chawi el Balchi the free-thinker, may also be reckoned as belonging to the sect. All these flourished before the 10th century.

The general tenets of the Karaites, as contained in the writings of Anan and his successors, and as learned from the Arab historians, are the Unity of God, the Justice of God, the right of reason to interpret Scripture, the freedom of the human will, and the separation of God from all direct influence in human affairs. Jesus and Mohammed were both admitted to be prophets of God. The Talmud was wholly rejected. Of the practical heresies of the sect, the chief were the alterations made in the calendar and in the arrangement of the Jewish feasts, and the almost ascetic rules of personal morality and decorum. The claim of all teachers to a respectful hearing, the duty of free inquiry, and the duty of missionary labor, were positively enjoined. The most important duty, however, of the Karaite teacher, was to show and explain the text of Scripture. The followers of Anan did not conform their views to his in all respects, and there were numerous sects within the sect. In some instances it was joined with political fanaticism. Its chief seat was at Jerusalem, but in a century from its foundation it had spread into many distant lands, to Morocco, the Crimea, and Persia, and had branches in the principal cities of Western Asia. Its teachers were zealous, indefatigable, given to controversy, and generally pure in their lives. They were fiercely opposed by the Rabbins, and not favored by the secular powers. Anan himself was virtually an exile in Jerusalem.

2. On Bekker's Digammated Text of Homer, by Prof. James Hadley, of New Haven.

After alluding to the unfortunate attempt of Payne Knight in his *Iliad* (London, 1820), to restore the lost digamma, Prof. H. described the services rendered by Immanuel Bekker to Homeric criticism, referring particularly to his Homeric researches, printed, since 1857, in the *Monatsberichte* of the Berlin Academy. His edition of Homer in 1843, while it showed a marked advance on that of Wolf, followed essentially the same method, aiming in general to reproduce the text constituted by Aristarchus. But in his recent edition (Bonn, 1858), he has avowedly taken up a new principle—that of analogy—and, by the help of it, has sought to go back beyond Aristarchus. At the same time he has introduced the digamma, but with evident caution, abstaining almost wholly from violent or arbitrary changes of the text. He recognizes only an initial digamma, but retains it in cases where by a prefix or by composition it is brought into the middle of a word. Having determined from the indications of the verse what words should have digamma, he applies it to those words, wherever the verse allows it, or can by easy changes be made to allow it. Before noticing particular words, Prof. H. adverted to the cases in which hiatus was allowed in the epic verse, and which therefore give little evidence of a digamma. He also referred to the fact proved by Ahrens (in Kuhn's *Ztschft.*, x. 60 ff.), that for words which are clearly digammated in Homer, the proportion of unconformable cases (where the verse, as it stands in the common text, or after rejecting a movable ν , forbids the digamma) does not usually exceed 7 or 8 per cent. He then showed that ἰσόμεαι, 'to guard,' ought not to have been written by Bekker with digamma, the unconformable cases being about 40 per cent, while for the middle or passive of ἰσώω, 'to draw,' they are not more than 5 per cent. He objected to the procedure of Bekker in prefixing digamma to augmented forms (like εἰδών, ἡγασσας, ἡνδαν) of digammate verbs; and also in omitting digamma from reduplicated forms of such verbs in many instances where the verse allows it. He considered the question whether, in accordance with the views of Curtius and others, Bekker should have recognized a primitive y -sound as having produced the same appearances with digamma in the Homeric verse. Such traces of initial y Curtius (*Grundzüge d. griech. Etymol.*, ii. 177 ff.) finds in εἰκα, ἔμαι, and the relative stem (δ, γ, δ, ωs, etc.); of which Bekker writes the first two with digamma, the last with initial vowel. It was shown, however, that Curtius's derivation of εἰκα from the stem δῖκ (δείκνυμι, 'to show')—through the forms δῖνικ, γῖνικ, whence γῖγικα—is open to strong objections and has little probability. That ἔμαι, 'to send,' is for $yi-yá-mi$, 'to cause to go,' is highly probable: but in Homer this verb clearly began with a vowel, while ἔμαι, 'to long,' as clearly began with a consonant: it is, therefore, unsafe to identify the two. As to the relative stem—in which, according to some recent writers (Kuhn's *Ztschft.*, viii. 401 ff., ix. 320), h is for v , and that for kv or sv —the weak indications of a consonant in Homer favor the belief that h is for

γ (cf. Sk. *yas*); though possibly ὡς, 'as,' which presents frequent evidence of a consonant initial, may have begun with *v*. Again it has been supposed that some words in Homer show signs of a lost initial σ. Along with ῥῆς, he uses the earlier σῆς; and in like manner, Ahrens (Kuhn's *Ztschrift*, x. 65 ff.) maintains that along with the usual ὅλη, ἰός, ἱκαστος, he used the earlier σῶλη (*silva*), σῆος (*suus*), and σῆκαστος. This view, though plausible, is still too uncertain to warrant the introduction of a σ into the text: but Bekker's writing of ἰός and ἱκαστος with initial digamma is decidedly objectionable.

3. On the Muslim Doctrine of Predestination and Moral Responsibility, by Prof. Edward E. Salisbury, of New Haven.

In this paper are first brought together some expressions of the lyric muse of the Arabs, either pre- or early post-Islamic, which indicate the direction of the Arab mind, at that period, with respect to the opposite phases of belief based upon the consciousness of human efficiency, on the one hand, and the persuasion of a superhuman overruling power, on the other—showing that the early Arabs were bare fatalists, manifesting in their popular songs no spirit of reverence for personal divinities. Then follows an exhibition of the substance of the teachings of the Kurân on the subject of predestination, from which it appears that Muhammad no more denied human freedom than he predicated of God a sovereignty which embraces even the actions of men, both bad and good. The paper also embraces a translation and discussion of all the traditions of Bukhârî and Muslim which relate to the subject—confirming the view derived from the Kurân itself, that Muhammad held to freedom of the will in connection with belief in divine sovereignty. The remainder of the paper is devoted to a summary of the speculations on predestination of the Muslim theologians, down to the twelfth century, as set forth by Shah-rastâni.

The whole paper is designed to serve as a contribution of materials for an historical exposition of the opinions held among Muhammadans respecting divine sovereignty and human freedom; with only incidental references to the genesis of the opinions brought into view: in the hope, however, of facilitating inquiry, on this point, to those familiar with the history of philosophy among other nations, especially of the West.

4. A Süfi Catechism, by Mehemmed Missiree, on the Tesavuf, or Spiritual Life of the Süfis; translated from the Turkish by John P. Brown, Esq., of Constantinople: presented by Prof. Salisbury.

In a letter accompanying this paper, Mr. Brown writes as follows:

"I do myself the honor of sending you a little translation from a part of a Turkish manuscript which lately fell into my hands, on the Tesavuf, or Spiritual Life of the Softees, which I consider very interesting. So little is known—or, at least, so little has been translated—on this subject, that I believe this is almost unique, and will be read with interest by all Orientalists. It will form a part of the work on which I have been engaged now for some years, on Islammysticism, or an account of all the dervish sects, now almost finished."

The extract translated is in the form of questions and answers: it treats of faith as the foundation of the spiritual life; of the distinction between the Süfis and common people; of the doctrines of the former respecting metempsychosis; of their sects; of their mystic use of amatory and convivial terms; of their peculiar vision of God, etc., etc.

Prof. Salisbury read parts of the translation, and added, in farther illustration of the character of Süfism, extracts from Schmölder's *Essai sur les Ecoles Philosophiques chez les Arabes*, and from Tholuck's *Sufismus*.

In the discussion which followed the reading of this paper, Dr. Van Lennep gave an account of his own dealings with and observations upon the Moslem mystics or dervishes, setting forth especially their doctrinal liberality or disregard of creeds. Rev. Mr. Washburn, of Syria, spoke of Mr. Brown's intimate relations with the leaders of the mystics in Constantinople, and their assistance liberally afforded him in the preparation of his account of the sects, and thought his work, when published, would be of the highest authority and value.

5. On the Peculiarities of the Turkish or Osmanli Dialect, by Rev. Henry J. Van Lennep, D.D., Missionary in Turkey.

Dr. Van Lennep commenced with referring to the Turkish or Osmanli as a language still to an important degree in process of formation. Grammars, dictionaries, and a national literature are almost wanting as standards of speech. An illustration of the rapidity of change is found in the fact that, within the space of thirty years, several new or completely revised translations of the Scriptures have been found necessary. The writer described the field occupied by the language, and pointed out the modifying influences which had been at work upon the latter, resulting from the mixture of races, and the changing succession of immigrations and supremacies in the empire. The amalgamation of races had been extensive and rapid, being greatly favored by the general adoption of Islam; since, in the East, political and social distinctions depend much more on religious belief than on descent. Christianity was likely to play an important part in determining the character and the language of the Osmanli people.

The most striking features of the Osmanli language were explained. The euphonic law of the harmonic sequence of vowels was fully set forth and illustrated, and was held to be much more elaborately developed and consistently observed here than in the ruder Tatar dialects. The formation of words was solely by means of suffixes, to the exclusion of prefixes. The condensation and precision attained were instanced by the forms of derivative conjugation, and by selected phrases, which were analyzed to exhibit their peculiarities of construction. The elegance of the cultivated dialect, especially as spoken by city ladies of the higher classes, was not easily to be surpassed. The imperfect Arabic alphabet had had a notable influence upon the form of the written language, as read by the learned. The Greek and Armenian modes of writing, especially the latter, suited much better the spoken tongue. Little of the literature was in the popular dialect, free from pedantic intermixture with Arabic and Persian.

6. The Tâittiriya Prâtiçâkhyâ, by Prof. William D. Whitney, of New Haven.

Without occupying the time of the Society by any detailed account of this work, which had already been sufficiently described in previous communications, Prof. Whitney stated that, being well supplied with manuscript material for its publication, he had so far advanced his labors upon it as to be able to promise its appearance in the next volume of the Society's Journal.

7. On the Kurdish Tribes of Western Asia, by Rev. William Clark, formerly Missionary in Armenia, now of West Brattleboro, Vt.

This essay contained the results, in part, of Mr. Clark's own observations upon the Kurds, and experiences among them, during his residence of several years in their country, and in part, also, of his study of authors who have written upon them; and it was a complete summary of what is known respecting their country, race, manners and customs, and religious beliefs.

Mr. Clark first gave an account of the mountainous and romantic region occupied by the modern Kurds, describing its fastnesses and valleys, and the surprises which constantly meet the traveller there. He referred to the ancient history of the people, to their identity with the Carduchi described by Xenophon, and their unchanged character since his time, and to their claimed affinity with the ancient Chaldees; passing thence to their relations to modern Persian and Turkish history. Their language was evidently of Iranian stock, but its position in the family was not fully determined. Their number was one and a half to two millions; they were broken up into little tribes, headed by independent chiefs. Mr. Clark went on to depict their character and qualities, of which he took a highly favorable view, praising their independence, their hospitality, their well-bred and decorous manners, their treatment of their women, etc. Their music and dancing were made the subject of description. Their acceptance of Islam was shown to be but nominal, and their native superstitions were characterized.

8. On the Leyden and Berne Manuscripts of Petronius, and their Relations to each other, by Prof. Charles Beck, of Cambridge.

Of the two manuscripts to which this paper relates, both belonging to the class usually called *Vulgata* or *Vulgaria Excerpta*, the former in part fills a *lacuna* of the latter; and it is a theory advanced by Büchler, in his edition of the *Satyricon*, that they were both originally parts of the same manuscript. Dr. Beck enters into a detailed examination and comparison of the two, and arrives at the conclusion that the supposition of any such relation between them is questionable, and even very improbable.

9. On the more Prominent Characteristics of the Zulu Language, by Rev. Lewis Grout, lately Missionary in Southern Africa, now of Saxton's River, Vermont.

Mr. Grout illustrated, so far as the scanty time allowed, the striking characteristics of the family of South African languages to which the Zulu belongs. The peculiarity of their phonetic system consisted in the employment of the three kinds of clicks, dental, palatal, and lateral, as constituents of the alphabet. These were often of onomatopoeic origin, and were as essential parts of the spoken language as any of the consonants. As regards the formation of words, the prevalence of preformatives and changes at the beginnings of words was dwelt upon. The nouns were divided into declensions or classes, according to their initial changes, and it was shown how the adjective and pronoun incipients were varied to agree with those of the nouns, giving rise to a kind of alliterative concord, having syntactic, not euphonic, value. The great variety of the forms of the verb was finally made the subject of remark.

The time of adjournment of the morning session having arrived, it was concluded to defer till another occasion the presentation of the two or three papers still remaining upon the docket, and to close the meeting. Accordingly, after passing a vote of thanks to the American Academy of Arts and Sciences for kindly granting the use of its room as the place of meeting, the Society adjourned, to come together again in New Haven on Wednesday, October 14th, 1863.